

Drawings

The objected to drawings have been corrected as per the examiners suggestions.

Specification

As per your suggestion, the specifications have been carefully revised in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. During the revising of the specifications, I reworded certain paragraphs and made changes in phrasing that I feel are allowed with by MPEP 2163.06-07. In doing so, I do not believe that I have introduced prohibited new matter.

Claims Objections

The objected to claims 1 through 24 have been re-written using the allowed claims that you were so kind as to draft for me as a foundation for the claims that are now before you.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 112

The claims rejected under the first paragraph 35 U.S.C. 112 (claims 1, 4-7, 9, and 22) were primarily rejected based upon the manner in which the specification was written, and while being enabled, parts of the claims do not reasonably provide enablement for the limitation recited in the claims.

As such, now that the specifications have been re-written based upon your advice and that you wrote claims that I further added additional information. I believe you will find that the re-

written claims will are now clear, concise and written in exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention, etc.

The claims rejected under the second paragraph 35 U.S.C. 112 (claims 1- 9, and 10- 24) were primarily rejected based upon the manner in which the specification was written, and being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter which I regard as my invention.

Again, now that the specifications have been re-written based upon your advice and that you wrote claims that I further added additional information. I believe you will find that the re-written claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which I regard as my invention.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 101

The claims rejected under the 35 U.S.C. 101 (claims 3, and 10- 24) were primarily rejected because it was felt that my invention was directed toward non-statutory subject matter.

Due to the fact that the specifications have been re-written based upon your advice and that you wrote claims that I further added additional information to. I believe you will find that the re-written claims particularly point out and distinctly claim a new, useful and novel invention.